



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,429	06/02/2005	David Boxenhorn	29913	3153
67801	7590	08/13/2009	EXAMINER	
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.			YOUSSEF, ADEL Y	
P.O. BOX 16446				
ARLINGTON, VA 22215			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/537,429	BOXENHORN, DAVID
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ADEL YOUSSEF	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 55-85.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 55-85 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 55-85 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06/02/2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/28/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered by indicating that the argument is moot in view of new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 55-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al (PGUB No: 2002/0073236) and Brown et al. (PGUB No: 2003/0061317) in view of Arunachalam et al. (PGUB No: 2003/0069922).

Regarding claim 55, Helgeson et al. teach a networked computing system for facilitating independent remote access to data, said system comprising: a plurality of remote terminal devices; and a plurality of hosting servers, each one of said plurality of hosting servers being associated with a first unique identity, said plurality of hosting servers operative for storing said data in at least one software object hosted thereon said software object comprising: enablement data, (paragraph 215, lines 2-10, see figure 4); (the reference teaches an interface that contains mechanisms to manipulate various kinds of display style to generate and execute web links which is read as enablement data); a first identity arrangement for holding said first unique identity indicating one of said plurality of hosting servers or provider of said (paragraph 519, lines 1-10, see figure 8a) (the reference teaches that inside web server 800 based on XML) for holding a first identity (that's XML Protocol) indicating a host or provider (fig 4, #419,421 or 423) of said object (paragraph 13, lines 2-7); (interface server 417 communicates with server 421 using XML protocol) object, (paragraph 39, line 5, paragraph 66, paragraph 86, paragraph 206, see tables 8a, 9) and a second identity arrangement for holding respective second unique identities of specific remote entities establishing a relationship with said object via a network through respective remote terminal devices, (paragraph 526, lines 1-3) for holding a second identity (HTML, XSL/XSLT or WAPNXML Protocol) of a remote entity Establishing a relationship with said object via a network (paragraph 215, lines 10-14 , see figure 4); (interface server 417 Communicates using HTML protocol with web server 405) except for wherein said first and said second identity

arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of said at least one software object simultaneously, while each one of said at least one software object uniquely preserves the said enablement data's associated said first hosting and said second relationship identities. However Brown et al. teach wherein said first and said second identity arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of said at least one software object simultaneously (paragraph 11), while each one of said at least one software object (paragraph 11) uniquely preserves the said enablement data's associated said first hosting and said second relationship identities (paragraph 19, see figure 2, Brown teaches user identification information is passed in the request and authenticated by a server). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson to include software object as taught by Brown in order to provide SSL connection start with the URL address of "https:" instead of "http:", thereby improve the quality of communication service.

Helgeson & Brown don't teach wherein said first and said second identity arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of a first of said hosted software objects simultaneously said respective host and second identity arrangements being preserved with said access such that manipulations of said software object by any one of said remote entities is independent of manipulation of said remote object by any other remote entities, and wherein each respective second, relationship, identity is transferable with correspondingly independently manipulated data to another one of said hosting

servers for a second manipulation with a further software object at said another hosting server said second manipulation preserving said second, relationship, identity, thereby allowing said respective remote entity to retain a relationship with said further software object after manipulation thereof through said first software object .

However Arunachalam teach wherein said first (#630, see figure 6) and said second identity (#640, see figure 6) arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of a first of said hosted software objects simultaneously (paragraph 72, that manage a plurality of distributed service and application software objects or components. The term "objects" will be used to refer to separable software objects) said respective host and second identity (#640, see figure 6) arrangements being preserved with said access such that manipulations of said software object by any one of said remote entities is independent of manipulation of said remote object by any other remote entities (paragraphs 133, 136, that allow a remote object to be called similarly to a local), and wherein each respective second, relationship, identity is transferable with correspondingly independently manipulated data to another one of said hosting servers for a second manipulation with a further software object at said another hosting server (paragraphs 251, 361, see figure 19, the reference Id uniquely specifies which object on the WxRemoteConnectionServer is pointed to), said second manipulation preserving said second, relationship, identity, thereby allowing said respective remote entity to retain a relationship with said further software object after manipulation thereof through said first software object

(paragraph 66, that allows collaborative and cooperative transactions and interactions that are not possible in prior art approaches). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson & Brown to include first and said second identity arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of a first of said hosted software objects simultaneously said respective host and second identity arrangements as taught by Arunachalam in order to provide control and manage a plurality of distributed service, thereby improve control and manage cooperation and interaction among a plurality of service providers that each contribute to the transaction (paragraph 14).

Regarding claim 56, Helgeson et al. further teach the system of claim 55, wherein each one of said hosted software objects has been uniquely created upon a message associated with at least one of said specific remote entities(paragraph 300, line2, paragraph 841, lines 4-8, paragraph 884, line 2, paragraph 886, lines 3-5, paragraph 892).

Regarding claim 57, Helgeson et al. further teach The system of claim 55, wherein said plurality of hosting servers is configured for storing objects that hold in common at least one of said first and said second unique identity (paragraph 227, paragraph 278).

Regarding claim 58, Helgeson et al. further teach the system of claim 55,

wherein each of said objects consists of an object identity, said object identity being selected such that a combination, for said object, of said first identity, said second identity and said object identity is unique within said system (paragraph 298, lines 1-3, paragraph 305).

Regarding claim 59, Helgeson et al. further teach the system of claim 55, wherein at least one of said objects is described by a class which is local to one of said plurality of hosting servers on which said at least one object resides (paragraph 382, lines 1-4, paragraph 385, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 60, Helgeson et al. further teach the system of claim 59, wherein said class supports at least one service of a plurality of services, said services comprising object definitions, and being global to the whole system (paragraph 439, line 2, paragraph 444, paragraph 997, line 1-3).

Regarding claim 61, Helgeson et al. further teach The system of claim 55, comprising authentication hosting module operative for respective remote users, such that each remote user has an assigned authentication host for said system (paragraph 50, line 3, paragraph 98, paragraph 1052, line 2).

Regarding claim 62, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, wherein said enablement data further comprises at least one

of a link, attributes a class identity and behavior (paragraph 237, lines 1, 2, paragraph 241, line 7-11, paragraph 244).

Regarding claim 63, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, wherein said remote terminal device further comprising a user interface via which remote entity is able to carry out interactions therewith (paragraph 317, lines 1-3, paragraph 318, lines 1, 2, paragraph 357, lines 11-14).

Regarding claim 64, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 63, wherein said user interface is configurable to permit interactions with other objects stored on said plurality of hosting servers (paragraph 230, lines 2-5, paragraph 232, lines 1-4, 244, 145, lines 6-10).

Regarding claim 65, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, wherein at least one of said objects is configured as an interface object to communicate between said remote entity thorough said remote terminal device and another object, said interface object comprising: a translating software module for translating messages between an external messaging protocol and an internal system protocol (paragraph 12, lines 2-5, paragraph 42, lines 1-3, paragraph 214), and a communication software module for relaying messages between said remote entity through said remote terminal device and another object via said translating unit (paragraph 13, paragraph 844, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 66, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 65, wherein said translating unit is operable to relay messages between a plurality of other objects and said remote entity through said remote terminal device (paragraph 13, paragraph 844, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 67, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 65, comprising selectable interface functionality, each suitable for a different remote terminal device (paragraph 317, lines 1-3, paragraph 375, lines 9-12).

Regarding claim 68, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of any preceding claims wherein said enablement data further comprises at least one attribute being configured to store representational information, said predetermined object behaviors allow altering of said at least one attribute (paragraph 237, lines 1, 2, paragraph 241, line 7-11, paragraph 244).

Regarding claim 66, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 65, configured to generate messages in response to user interactions at said remote device and to send said messages to said another object (paragraph 227, 229, line 3, paragraph 237).

Regarding claim 70, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 69, wherein said messages comprise one of HTTP messages

(paragraphs 591, 1032), XML messages (paragraph 1052, 1080), SOAP messages and WSML messages (paragraph 215, lines 10-14 , see figure 4);(interface server 417 Communicates using HTML protocol with web server 405).

Regarding claim 71, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 69, wherein said messages are specific responses to any one of a group of computer - user interaction consist at least one of the following user interaction: a key press, a mouse click, a mouse drag, a mouse select, a mouse drag and drop, a cut action, a copy action, a paste action, a launch action, an undo action, a redo action, a repeat action, and a delete action (paragraph 237, paragraph 225).

Regarding claim 72, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, wherein said object further comprises: a list, associated with a data item or event, comprising at least one object that has indicated a need to be updated regarding said data item or event, and a publish module associated with said list for sending messages regarding data item or event to said at least one object (paragraphs 280, 703, 840).

Regarding claim 73, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 72, wherein said list module is programmable, to allow a user through said remote terminal device to alter said list (paragraphs 1048, 1081).

Regarding claim 74, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 73, further comprising a plurality of data items or events, and wherein said list module is configured to provide separate lists for different ones of said data items or events (paragraphs 231, 282).

Regarding claim 75, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 69, wherein said user interactions comprise interactions comprising associations with other objects, said associations being made at said remote terminal device (paragraph 317, lines 1-3, paragraph 375, lines 9-12).

Regarding claim 76, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 75, configured such that said interactions at said remote terminal device generate commands that include identification data of a respective one of said other objects (paragraphs 14, 207, 212).

Regarding claim 77, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, further comprising an object ID, which, together with said first and said second identities, provides a unique identity thereto (paragraphs 385, 389).

Regarding claim 78, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 65, further comprising a desktop object software module located

between said interfacing object and said at least one object, said desktop object being configured to represent said at least one object as a desktop icon and to provide desktop icon functionality to said remote entity (paragraphs 588, 728, 761).

Regarding claim 79, Helgeson et al. further teach the networked computing system of claim 55, wherein said remote terminal devices are adapted to simultaneously access a plurality of objects which are hosted on a plurality of said plurality of hosting servers (paragraphs 382, 385).

Regarding claim 80, Helgeson et al. further teach a hosting server for providing computing services via a network to a plurality of remote users, the hosting server being associated with a first unique identity, said hosting server comprising: a network interface for interaction with remote users over said network; at least one first hosted software object (paragraph 15, lines 2-9, paragraph16, lines 1-3, see figure 1); at least one interfacing software object adjusted to facilitate independent access of each of said remote users simultaneously to said first software object said first software object and said interfacing software object each comprising: enablement data (paragraph 215,lines 2-10, see figure 4); (the reference teaches an interface that contains mechanisms to manipulate various kinds of display style to generate and execute web links which is read as enablement data), a first identity arrangement for holding said first unique identity indicating a host or

provider of said object (paragraph 519, lines 1-10, see figure 8a), and a second identity arrangement for holding a second unique identity of any one of said remote entities currently establishing a relationship with said object via a network said interfacing object being able to exclusively send user interface messaging to a respective remote user via said network (paragraph 526, lines 1-3) for holding a second identity (HTML, XSL/XSLT or WAPNXML Protocol and software) of a remote entity Establishing a relationship with said object via a network (paragraph 215, lines 10-14 , see figure 4);(interface server 417 Communicates using HTML protocol with web server 405), and to interpret user interactions of said respective remote user independently of interactions made by others of said remote entities for messaging to one other further remotely (paragraph 39, lines 2-4, paragraph 231, lines 1-3, paragraph 241, lines 1-6) except for located unique first software objects, thereby to allow said remote user to independently access said unique servicing software objects, said interfacing object retaining its first unique identity .However Brown teach unique first software objects, thereby to allow said remote user to independently access said unique servicing software objects paragraph11).Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson to include software object as taught by Brown in order to provide SSL connection start with the URL address of "https:" instead of "http:", thereby improve the quality of communication service and Helgeson & Brown don't teach said second unique identity, thereby to allow said remote user to independently and identifiably access said other further unique software object from said first

hosted software object. However Arunachalam teach second unique identity, thereby to allow said remote user to independently and identifiably access said other further unique software object from said first hosted software object (paragraph 54, 95, see figure 11, that teach the object type together with the object instance serves to uniquely identify a specific instantiation of the object). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson & Brown to include thereby to allow said remote user to independently and identifiably access said other further unique software object from said first hosted software object as taught by Arunachalam in order to provide identify and access these objects from the web server node, based on the network addresses recorded in the DOLSIB, thereby distributed control of Events, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, and Security (ECAPS) (paragraph 54).

Regarding claim 81, Helgeson et al. further teach a method for providing a plurality of remote devices with the ability to access a plurality of hosting servers independently, the method comprising:

- a) providing access for a plurality of remote terminal devices (paragraph 215, lines 6-13, see figure 4);
- b) providing a plurality of hosting servers each being associated with a receptive host identity, each of said plurality of hosting servers operative for storing at least one hosted software object, each object associated with a specific user (paragraph 382, lines 1-5, paragraph 385, lines 1-3, paragraph 443, paragraph

870, lines 1-3);

c) packaging into said hosted software object: enablement data (paragraph 215, lines 2-10, see figure 4); (the reference teaches an interface that contains mechanisms to manipulate various kinds of display style to generate and execute web links which is read as enablement data),,a first identity arrangement for holding said host identity indicating a hosting server or provider of said object (paragraph 519, lines 1-10, see figure 8a) (the reference teaches that inside web server 800 based on XML) for holding a first identity (that's XML Protocol) indicating a host or provider (fig 4, #419,421 or 423) of said object (paragraph 13, lines 2-7); (interface server 417 communicates with server 421 using XML protocol) , and a second identity arrangement for holding a second identity of a specific remote entity establishing a relationship with said object via a network through said remote terminal device (paragraph 526, lines 1-3) for holding a second identity (HTML, XSL/XSLT or WAPNXML Protocol) of a remote entity Establishing a relationship with said object via a network (paragraph 215, lines 10-14, see figure 4) ;(interface server 417 Communicates using HTML protocol with web server 405);; and

d) receiving a request from a respective remote entity over a network, the request relating to said object, the request being received through said remote terminal device, the request setting said second identity to identify said respective remote entity and object while retaining said first identity, thereby establishing a relationship between said remote entity (paragraph 14, line 2, paragraph 313, lines 1-4, paragraph 226, 1-2) and except for said hosted

software object. However Brown teach hosted software object (paragraph 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson to include software object as taught by Brown in order to provide SSL connection start with the URL address of "https:" instead of "http:", thereby improve the quality of communication service and Helgeson & Brown don't teach e) receiving a request from said respective remote device for said hosted software object to interact with a further software object at another of said plurality of hosting servers, said hosted software object responding to said interaction request by sending interaction messaging to said further software object, said interaction messaging including said host identity and said second identity , thereby to identify any interaction carried out at said further software object in consequence of said interaction request as being associated with said respective remote user , thereby enabling said respective remote user to bring about uniquely identified interactions between data on different ones of said hosting servers . However Arunachalam teach e) receiving a request from said respective remote device for said hosted software object to interact with a further software object at another of said plurality of hosting servers (paragraphs 48, see figure 1, that a network transactional application including control and routing software objects and distributed remote software objects to interface with the network transactional application and perform controlled transactions), said hosted software object responding to said interaction request by sending interaction messaging to said further software object, said interaction messaging including said host identity and said second

identity (paragraph 103, see figures 13, 14, that application programs that provided by application service (#1440, see figure 14) include multi-media messaging, archival/retrieval management), thereby to identify any interaction carried out at said further software object in consequence of said interaction request (paragraph 66, see figure 5) as being associated with said respective remote user (paragraph 50, see figure 3), thereby enabling said respective remote user to bring about uniquely identified interactions between data on different ones of said hosting servers (paragraph 54, that uniquely address and identify network locations and objects by a unique network address). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Helgeson & Brown to include remote device for said hosted software object to interact with a further software object at another of said plurality of hosting servers as taught by Arunachalam in order to provide transactions to be performed while allowing one entity (e.g., a context owner) to control the transaction, thereby improve control and manage cooperation and interaction among a plurality of service providers that each contribute to the transaction (paragraph 14).

Regarding claim 82, Helgeson et al. further teach a method of claim 81, further comprising: creating an interface object, said interface object being responsive at least to standard user interaction events, and receiving interaction messaging through said remote terminal device from said remote entity at said interface object and using said interaction messaging to activate said at least one behavior

said further software object (paragraph 840, lines 3-7, paragraph 972, paragraph 1201, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 83, Helgeson et al. further teach a method of claim 81, comprising using said second identity for personalization of said object for said remote entity using said remote terminal device (paragraph 60, lines 1-3, paragraph 66).

Regarding claim 84, Helgeson et al. further teach the method of claim 83, comprising using respective second identities to define an aggregation of personalized objects as a workspace environment for said remote entity (paragraphs 226, 299, and 323).

Regarding claim 85, Helgeson et al. further teach the method of claim 81, further comprising a step between said step c) and said step d) of packaging into said hosted software object an third identity, which, together with said first identity and said second identity, provides a unique identity thereto (paragraph 299, paragraph 389, lines 1-4).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed** to (571) 273-8300 or **mailed to**:

Commissioner for patents
P.O.Box1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adel Y. Youssef whose telephone number is 571-270-3525. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANDERSON MATTHEW can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ADEL YOUSSEF/

Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Matthew D. Anderson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618